



# UNITED STATES PATENT AND TRADEMARK OFFICE

UNITED STATES DEPARTMENT OF COMMERCE  
United States Patent and Trademark Office  
Address: COMMISSIONER FOR PATENTS  
P.O. Box 1450  
Alexandria, Virginia 22313-1450  
www.uspto.gov

APPLICATION NO.	FILING DATE	FIRST NAMED INVENTOR	ATTORNEY DOCKET NO.	CONFIRMATION NO.
10/089,147	03/27/2002	Helmut Kindl	50815	9820

26474 7590 02/22/2006

NOVAK DRUCE DELUCA & QUIGG, LLP  
1300 EYE STREET NW  
SUITE 400 EAST  
WASHINGTON, DC 20005

EXAMINER

PAK, YONG D

ART UNIT PAPER NUMBER

1652

DATE MAILED: 02/22/2006

Please find below and/or attached an Office communication concerning this application or proceeding.

<b>Office Action Summary</b>	Application No. 10/089,147	Applicant(s) KINDL ET AL.	
	Examiner Yong D. Pak	Art Unit 1652	

-- The MAILING DATE of this communication appears on the cover sheet with the correspondence address --

### Period for Reply

A SHORTENED STATUTORY PERIOD FOR REPLY IS SET TO EXPIRE 3 MONTH(S) OR THIRTY (30) DAYS, WHICHEVER IS LONGER, FROM THE MAILING DATE OF THIS COMMUNICATION.

- Extensions of time may be available under the provisions of 37 CFR 1.136(a). In no event, however, may a reply be timely filed after SIX (6) MONTHS from the mailing date of this communication.
- If NO period for reply is specified above, the maximum statutory period will apply and will expire SIX (6) MONTHS from the mailing date of this communication.
- Failure to reply within the set or extended period for reply will, by statute, cause the application to become ABANDONED (35 U.S.C. § 133). Any reply received by the Office later than three months after the mailing date of this communication, even if timely filed, may reduce any earned patent term adjustment. See 37 CFR 1.704(b).

### Status

- 1) ☒ Responsive to communication(s) filed on 22 January 2005.
- 2a) ☐ This action is FINAL.                      2b) ☒ This action is non-final.
- 3) ☐ Since this application is in condition for allowance except for formal matters, prosecution as to the merits is closed in accordance with the practice under *Ex parte Quayle*, 1935 C.D. 11, 453 O.G. 213.

### Disposition of Claims

- 4) ☒ Claim(s) 1-20 is/are pending in the application.
- 4a) Of the above claim(s) 5,7 and 15-20 is/are withdrawn from consideration.
- 5) ☐ Claim(s) \_\_\_\_\_ is/are allowed.
- 6) ☒ Claim(s) 1-4,6 and 8-14 is/are rejected.
- 7) ☐ Claim(s) \_\_\_\_\_ is/are objected to.
- 8) ☐ Claim(s) \_\_\_\_\_ are subject to restriction and/or election requirement.

### Application Papers

- 9) ☐ The specification is objected to by the Examiner.
- 10) ☐ The drawing(s) filed on \_\_\_\_\_ is/are: a) ☐ accepted or b) ☐ objected to by the Examiner.  
     Applicant may not request that any objection to the drawing(s) be held in abeyance. See 37 CFR 1.85(a).  
     Replacement drawing sheet(s) including the correction is required if the drawing(s) is objected to. See 37 CFR 1.121(d).
- 11) ☐ The oath or declaration is objected to by the Examiner. Note the attached Office Action or form PTO-152.

### Priority under 35 U.S.C. § 119

- 12) ☒ Acknowledgment is made of a claim for foreign priority under 35 U.S.C. § 119(a)-(d) or (f).
- a) ☒ All    b) ☐ Some \* c) ☐ None of:
1. ☐ Certified copies of the priority documents have been received.
2. ☐ Certified copies of the priority documents have been received in Application No. \_\_\_\_\_.
3. ☒ Copies of the certified copies of the priority documents have been received in this National Stage application from the International Bureau (PCT Rule 17.2(a)).

\* See the attached detailed Office action for a list of the certified copies not received.

### Attachment(s)

- |  |   |
|--|---|
| 1) <input type="checkbox"/> Notice of References Cited (PTO-892)   | 4) <input type="checkbox"/> Interview Summary (PTO-413)<br>Paper No(s)/Mail Date. _____ |
| 2) <input type="checkbox"/> Notice of Draftsperson's Patent Drawing Review (PTO-948)                                   | 5) <input type="checkbox"/> Notice of Informal Patent Application (PTO-152)             |
| 3) <input type="checkbox"/> Information Disclosure Statement(s) (PTO-1449 or PTO/SB/08)<br>Paper No(s)/Mail Date _____ | 6) <input type="checkbox"/> Other: _____  |

### **DETAILED ACTION**

This application is a 371 of PCT/EP00/09912.

#### ***Continued Examination Under 37 CFR 1.114***

A request for continued examination under 37 CFR 1.114, including the fee set forth in 37 CFR 1.17(e), was filed in this application after final rejection. Since this application is eligible for continued examination under 37 CFR 1.114, and the fee set forth in 37 CFR 1.17(e) has been timely paid, the finality of the previous Office action has been withdrawn pursuant to 37 CFR 1.114. Applicant's submission filed on November 22, 2005, amending claims 1-3 and 10-14, has been entered.

Claims 1-20 are pending. Claims 5, 7 and 15-20 are withdrawn. Claims 1-4, 6 and 8-14 are under consideration.

#### ***Response to Arguments***

Applicant's amendment and arguments filed on November 22, 2005, have been fully considered and are deemed to be persuasive to overcome the rejections previously applied. Rejections and/or objections not reiterated from previous office actions are hereby withdrawn.

#### ***Claim Objections***

Claim 4 is objected to because the claim recites "(c)" instead of "c)".

***Claim Rejections - 35 USC § 101***

35 U.S.C. 101 reads as follows:

Whoever invents or discovers any new and useful process, machine, manufacture, or composition of matter, or any new and useful improvement thereof, may obtain a patent therefor, subject to the conditions and requirements of this title.

Claims 10-14 are rejected under 35 U.S.C. 101 because the claimed invention is directed to a non-statutory subject matter.

Claims 10-14, as written, do not sufficiently distinguish over an organism as they exist naturally because the claims do not particularly point out any non-naturally occurring differences between the claimed products and the naturally occurring products. In the absence of the hand of man, the naturally occurring products are considered non-statutory subject matter. Furthermore, the claim as written does not make it clear that the cell was indeed transformed with the claimed polynucleotides as it recites "comprising". The claim as written can be interpreted as a cell naturally comprising the claimed polynucleotide but made recombinant due to transformation with any other DNA. Examiner suggests amending the claim to recite "an isolated host cell transformed with..." to overcome the rejection.

The rejection of the above claims have been amended in light of the amendment of the claims. The claims no longer read on human beings, but are still drawn to non-statutory subject matter.

***Claim Rejections - 35 USC § 112***

The following is a quotation of the second paragraph of 35 U.S.C. 112:

Art Unit: 1652

The specification shall conclude with one or more claims particularly pointing out and distinctly claiming the subject matter which the applicant regards as his invention.

Claims 1 and 4 and claims 2-3, 6 and 8-14 depending therefrom are rejected under 35 U.S.C. 112, second paragraph, as being indefinite for failing to particularly point out and distinctly claim the subject matter which applicant regards as the invention.

Claims 1 and 4 recite the phrase "shown in". The metes and bounds of the phrase in the context of the claims are not clear. It is not clear to the Examiner if the recited nucleic acid sequence has the nucleotide sequence of SEQ ID NO:1 or if the recited polypeptide has the amino acid sequence of SEQ ID NO:2 or whether the sequences are representative members of a genus. Examiner suggests amending the phrase as, for example, "the polypeptide comprising the amino acid sequence of SEQ ID NO:2" or "the nucleic acid sequence comprising the nucleotide sequence of SEQ ID NO:1".

Claims 2-3 are rejected under 35 U.S.C. 112, second paragraph, as being indefinite for failing to particularly point out and distinctly claim the subject matter which applicant regards as the invention.

Claims 2-3 recite the phrase "biosynthesis nucleic acid sequence". It is not clear to the Examiner what applicants mean by the above phrase. Examiner suggests deletion of the term "biosynthesis".

In response to the previous Office Action, applicants have traversed the above rejection. Applicants argue that the term "biosynthesis" has been deleted

Art Unit: 1652

from the claims. Examiner respectfully disagrees. The term was only deleted in claim 1.

Hence the rejection is maintained.

Claims 2-3 are rejected under 35 U.S.C. 112, second paragraph, as being indefinite for failing to particularly point out and distinctly claim the subject matter which applicant regards as the invention.

Claims 2-3 recite the phrase "a sequence of the following protein groups is used". The metes and bounds of the above phrase in the context of the claims are not clear. The claims do not recite protein groups, but just one protein group. Therefore, it is not clear to the Examiner what sequences are encompassed by the above phrase.

Claims 2-3 are rejected under 35 U.S.C. 112, second paragraph, as being indefinite for failing to particularly point out and distinctly claim the subject matter which applicant regards as the invention.

Claims 2-3 recite the phrase "An isolated nucleic acid sequence as claimed in claim 1, wherein a sequence of the following protein groups is used". The metes and bounds of the above phrase in the context of the claims are not clear. It is not clear as to how nucleic acid sequences can be linked to amino acid sequences.

In response to the previous Office Action, applicants have traversed the above rejection. Applicants argue that one of ordinary skill in the art would easily

Art Unit: 1652

be able to determine the nucleic acid sequences from the amino acid sequence of the protein. . Examiner respectfully disagrees. The claims do not recite this limitation. The claims, as written, only recite that "a sequence" of the protein is "used" as "nucleic acid sequence of the fatty acid or lipid metabolism" in a polynucleotide encoding a fusion protein.

Hence the rejection is maintained.

The following is a quotation of the first paragraph of 35 U.S.C. 112:

The specification shall contain a written description of the invention, and of the manner and process of making and using it, in such full, clear, concise, and exact terms as to enable any person skilled in the art to which it pertains, or with which it is most nearly connected, to make and use the same and shall set forth the best mode contemplated by the inventor of carrying out his invention.

Claims 1-4, 6 and 8-14 are rejected under 35 U.S.C. 112, first paragraph, as containing subject matter which was not described in the specification in such a way as to reasonably convey to one skilled in the relevant art that the inventor(s), at the time the application was filed, had possession of the claimed invention.

Claims 1-4, 6 and 8-14 are drawn to a polynucleotide encoding a fusion protein comprising a polypeptide having at least 80% sequence identity to SEQ ID NO:2 and  $\Delta$ -4 desaturase, wherein said polypeptide has any activity or no activity and the resulting fusion protein has any activity or no activity. The claims encompass polynucleotides encoding a fusion protein comprising polypeptides having at least 80% sequence identity to SEQ ID NO:2 and  $\Delta$ -4 desaturase. Therefore, these claims are drawn to a genus polynucleotides encoding a fusion

Art Unit: 1652

protein comprising  $\Delta$ -4 desaturase and a polypeptide having 80% amino acid sequence identity with SEQ ID NO:2 having any function, wherein said fusion protein has any or no activity. There is no disclosure of any particular structure to function/activity relationship in the disclosed species.

The claims are drawn to many functionally unrelated polynucleotides are encompassed within the scope of these claims, including partial sequences. The genus of these polynucleotides comprise a large variable genus with the potentiality of encompassing many different polynucleotides encoding fusion proteins having different activity or no activity. The specification discloses only a single species of the claimed genus, a polynucleotide encoding a fusion protein comprising a polypeptide of SEQ ID NO:2 and a  $\Delta$ -4 desaturase, wherein said desaturase continues to have  $\Delta$ -4 desaturase activity and SEQ ID NO:2 targets said desaturase to lipid bodies. The specification fails to describe additional representative species of the polynucleotides by any identifying characteristics or properties of the encoded polypeptides, for which no predictability of function is apparent. Therefore, one skilled in the art cannot reasonably conclude that the applicant had possession of the claimed invention at the time the instant application was filed.

Applicant is referred to the revised guidelines concerning compliance with the written description requirement of U.S.C. 112, first paragraph, published in the Official Gazette and also available at [www.uspto.gov](http://www.uspto.gov).

In response to the previous Office Action, applicants have traversed the above rejection. Applicants argue that the Examiner has stated that "one of



Art Unit: 1652

ordinary skill in the art would be able to arrive at a polynucleotide having 80% sequence identity to SEQ ID NO:1" and since applicants have amended the claims to recite "80%" and the specification on page 7 teaches computer program available to arrive at the claimed sequences, the claims meet the written description requirement. Examiner respectfully disagrees. It appears that applicants are using Examiner's statements out of context. Contrary to applicant's arguments, the last Office Action stated:

"while one of ordinary skill in the art would be able to arrive at a polynucleotide having 80% sequence identity to SEQ ID NO:1, the genus comprising polynucleotides having 60-80% sequence to SEQ ID NO:1 encoding polypeptides having unknown activity or no activity is widely divergent. The specification does not describe the function of all the polypeptide sequences derived or modified from SEQ ID NO:1 and therefore, many functionally unrelated polynucleotides are encompassed within the scope of these claims."

Applicants are directed to the underlined passage above. The claims remain ~~to~~ ~~be~~ drawn to polynucleotides encoding fusion proteins having any or no or unknown activity. As discussed in the written description guidelines, the written description requirement for a claimed genus may be satisfied through sufficient description of a representative number of species by actual reduction to practice, reduction to drawings, or by disclosure of relevant, identifying characteristics, i.e., structure or other physical and/or chemical properties, **by functional characteristics coupled with a known or disclosed correlation between function and structure, or by a combination of such identifying characteristics, sufficient to show the applicant was in possession of the**

Art Unit: 1652

**claimed genus.** A representative number of species means that the species which are adequately described are representative of the entire genus. **Thus, when there is substantial variation within the genus, one must describe a sufficient variety of species to reflect the variation within the genus.**

Satisfactory disclosure of a representative number depends on whether one of skill in the art would recognize that the applicant was in possession of the necessary common attributes or features of the elements possessed by the members of the genus in view of the species disclosed. For inventions in an unpredictable art, adequate written description of a genus which embraces widely variant species cannot be achieved by disclosing only one species within the genus. In the instant case the claimed genus of the claims includes species which are widely variant in function. The genus of the claims is functionally diverse as it encompasses polynucleotides encoding polypeptides with LBLOX activity, polypeptides that target proteins to lipid bodies and those which lack such activity and those with no activity. As such, the description of solely structural features present in all members of the genus is not sufficient to be representative of the attributes and features of the entire genus.

Hence the rejection is maintained.

Claims 1-4, 6 and 8-14 are rejected under 35 U.S.C. 112, first paragraph, because the specification, while being enabling for a polynucleotide encoding a fusion protein comprising a polypeptide of SEQ ID NO:2 and a  $\Delta$ -4 desaturase, wherein said desaturase continues to have  $\Delta$ -4 desaturase activity and SEQ ID

Art Unit: 1652

NO:2 targets said desaturase to lipid bodies, does not reasonably provide enablement for a polynucleotide comprising any polynucleotides encoding any  $\Delta$ -4 desaturase and a variant or mutant of SEQ ID NO:1 encoding a polypeptide having at least 80% amino acid sequence identity to SEQ ID NO:2, vectors and transformed host cells comprising the above, wherein the encoded polypeptide of SEQ ID NO:2 has any function or no function at all and wherein the final activity of fusion protein is unknown. The specification does not enable any person skilled in the art to which it pertains, or with which it is most nearly connected, to make and use the invention commensurate in scope with these claims.

Factors to be considered in determining whether undue experimentation is required are summarized in In re Wands 858 F.2d 731, 8 USPQ2nd 1400 (Fed. Cir, 1988). They include (1) the quantity of experimentation necessary, (2) the amount of direction or guidance presented, (3) the presence or absence of working examples, (4) the nature of the invention, (5) the state of the prior art, (6) the relative skill of those in the art, (7) the predictability or unpredictability of the art, and (8) the breadth of the claims.

Claims 1-4, 6 and 8-14 are directed to a fusion polynucleotide comprising a polynucleotide encoding an enzyme involved in fatty acid/lipid metabolism and a variant, mutant or recombinant of SEQ DI NO:1 encoding a polypeptide having at least 60-80% amino acid sequence identity to SEQ ID NO:2, vectors comprising said polynucleotide and organisms comprising said polynucleotide. Therefore, these claims are drawn to a genus of polynucleotides having any structure.

The scope of the claims is not commensurate with the enablement provided by the disclosure with regard to the extremely large number of polynucleotides comprising, variants and mutants broadly encompassed by the claims. Since the amino acid sequence of a protein determines its structural and functional properties, predictability of which changes can be tolerated in a protein's amino acid sequence and obtain the desired activity requires a knowledge of and guidance with regard to which amino acids in the protein's sequence, if any, are tolerant of modification and which are conserved (i.e. expectedly intolerant to modification), and detailed knowledge of the ways in which the proteins' structure relates to its function. However, in this case the disclosure is limited to a polynucleotide encoding a fusion protein comprising a specific fatty acid/lipid metabolism enzymes such as  $\Delta$ -4 desaturase and the SEQ ID NO:2.

It would require undue experimentation of the skilled artisan to make and use the claimed polynucleotides. The specification provides no guidance with regard to the making of variants and mutants of SEQ ID NO:2 or with regard to other uses. In view of the great breadth of the claim, amount of experimentation required to make the claimed polynucleotides, the lack of guidance, working examples, and unpredictability of the art in predicting function from a polypeptide primary structure, the claimed invention would require undue experimentation. As such, the specification fails to teach one of ordinary skill how to use the full scope of the polynucleotides encompassed by the claims.

While enzyme isolation techniques, recombinant and mutagenesis techniques are known, and it is routine in the art to screen for multiple substitutions or multiple modifications as encompassed by the instant claims, the specific amino acid positions within a protein's sequence where amino acid modifications can be made with a reasonable expectation of success in obtaining the desired activity/utility are limited in any protein and the result of such modifications is unpredictable. In addition, one skilled in the art would expect any tolerance to modification for a given protein to diminish with each further and additional modification, e.g. multiple substitutions.

The specification does not support the broad scope of the claims which encompass all modifications and fragments of polynucleotides of SEQ ID NO:1 encoding a polypeptide having at least 80% amino acid sequence identity to SEQ ID NO:2 because the specification does not establish: (A) regions of the encoded protein structure which may be modified without affecting LBLOX activity or its ability to target foreign proteins to lipid bodies; (B) the general tolerance of LBLOX to modification and extent of such tolerance; (C) a rational and predictable scheme for modifying any amino acid residue with an expectation of obtaining the desired biological function; (D) the specification provides insufficient guidance as to which of the essentially infinite possible choices is likely to be successful; (E) the specification is also silent regarding the final activity of fusion proteins of SEQ ID NO:2.

The claims also broadly encompass not only polynucleotides encoding LBLOX or fragments of LBLOX having ability to target foreign proteins to lipid

Art Unit: 1652

bodies and enzymes of fatty acid/lipid metabolism, but polynucleotides encoding polypeptides having any function or having no function. Therefore, the breadth of these claims is much larger than the scope enabled by the specification.

The specification does not teach how to make variants of polynucleotides of SEQ ID NO:1 or polynucleotides of fatty acid/lipid metabolism encoding polypeptides having any function. The function of a polypeptide cannot be predicted from its structure and the specification does not teach how to use polypeptides having any function or having no activity. The quantity of experimentation in this area is extremely large since there is significant variability in the activity of the polynucleotides in the claims. It would require significant study to identify the actual function of the encoded polypeptides and identifying a use for the encoded polypeptide would be an inventive, unpredictable and difficult undertaking. This would require years of inventive effort, with each of the many intervening steps, upon effective reduction to practice, not providing any guarantee of success in the succeeding steps.

The art is extremely unpredictable with regard to protein function in the absence of realizable information regarding its activity. Even very similar proteins may have every different functions. In the current case, where no specific information is known regarding the function, it is entirely unpredictable what function and activity will be found for the protein. The prior art does not resolve this ambiguity, since no prior art activity is identified for the encoded polypeptides.

Art Unit: 1652

Thus, applicants have not provided sufficient guidance to enable one of ordinary skill in the art to make and use the claimed invention in a manner reasonably correlated with the scope of the claims broadly including polynucleotide comprising variants and mutants of any polynucleotides of fatty acid/lipid metabolism and any mutants and variants of SEQ ID NO:1 encoding polypeptides having any structure and any function. The scope of the claims must bear a reasonable correlation with the scope of enablement (*In re Fisher*, 166 USPQ 19 24 (CCPA 1970)). Without sufficient guidance, determination of variants or mutants of SEQ ID NO:1 and polynucleotides of fatty acid/lipid metabolism having the desired biological characteristics is unpredictable and the experimentation left to those skilled in the art is unnecessarily, and improperly, extensive and undue. See *In re Wands* 858 F.2d 731, 8 USPQ2nd 1400 (Fed. Cir, 1988).

Since applicants have not submitted any arguments to the above rejection, the rejection is maintained.

### ***Claim Rejections - 35 USC § 103***

The following is a quotation of 35 U.S.C. 103(a) which forms the basis for all obviousness rejections set forth in this Office action:

(a) A patent may not be obtained though the invention is not identically disclosed or described as set forth in section 102 of this title, if the differences between the subject matter sought to be patented and the prior art are such that the subject matter as a whole would have been obvious at the time the invention was made to a person having ordinary skill in the art to which said subject matter pertains. Patentability shall not be negated by the manner in which the invention was made.

This application currently names joint inventors. In considering patentability of the claims under 35 U.S.C. 103(a), the examiner presumes that the subject matter of the various claims was commonly owned at the time any inventions covered therein were made absent any evidence to the contrary. Applicant is advised of the obligation under 37 CFR 1.56 to point out the inventor and invention dates of each claim that was not commonly owned at the time a later invention was made in order for the examiner to consider the applicability of 35 U.S.C. 103(c) and potential 35 U.S.C. 102(e), (f) or (g) prior art under 35 U.S.C. 103(a).

Claims 1-4, 6 and 8-14 are rejected under 35 U.S.C. 103(a) as being unpatentable over Hohne et al., Ohlrogge et al. and Yamamoto et al.

Claims 1-4, 6 and 8-14 are drawn to a polynucleotide encoding a protein comprising a  $\Delta$ -4 desaturase and SEQ ID NO:2, vector comprising said polynucleotide and *S. cerevisiae* comprising said polynucleotide.

Hohne et al. (form PTO-1449 – Eur. J. Biochem. 241, 1996: 6-11 and form PTO-892 - NCBI Accession CAA63483.1) discloses a polynucleotide encoding a lipid body lipxygenase (LBLOX), wherein amino acid at positions 1-244 is 100% identical to SEQ ID NO:2 (page 2, 3<sup>rd</sup> paragraph and see Sequence Alignment – cited previously on form PTO-892). Hohne et al. teaches that LBLOX is synthesized and transported to lipid bodies at the beginning of lipid body mobilization, during which fatty acids/lipids are metabolized (pages 6 and 8-9). Hohne et al. also teaches that the N-terminal region of LBLOX may represent a targeting sequence and may be responsible for the attachment of LBLOX to the



lipid body surface (page 10). Hohne et al. also teaches that a comparison between the molecular mass of the *in vitro* and *in vivo* form of LBLOX did not indicate significant proteolytic processing and LBLOX is only slightly higher in mass than its cytosolic form, suggesting that the N-terminal region of LBLOX contains a recognition site for lipid bodies (page 10). It is well within the skill available in the art to identify sequences in the N-terminal region of LBLOX that target LBLOX to lipid bodies and attach any protein to such sequences, in order to target the protein of interest to lipid bodies. Further, the claims do not recite that the fusion partner to the desaturase consist of SEQ ID NO:2, therefore, full length LBLOX of Hohne et al. or its N-terminal region comprising SEQ ID NO:2, are encompassed by scope of the claims.

The difference between the reference of Hohne et al. and the instant claims is that the reference of Hohne et al. does not teach a polynucleotide encoding a fusion protein comprising a  $\Delta$ -4 desaturase fused to LBLOX, vectors comprising said polynucleotide or microorganism comprising said polynucleotide.

Ohlrogge et al. (form PTO-892 - Oils-Fats-Lipids 1995) teaches a polynucleotide encoding a  $\Delta$ -4 desaturase, which is an enzyme of fatty acid/lipid metabolism (abstract).

Yamamoto et al. (form PTO-892 – U.S. Patent No. 5,506,120) teaches a polynucleotide encoding a fusion protein, linking proteins via a regulatory signal, vectors comprising said polynucleotide and a *Saccharomyces cerevisiae* comprising said polynucleotide (abstract and Columns 5-14).

Therefore, combining the teachings of the above references, it would have been obvious to one having ordinary skill in the art at the time the claimed invention was made to make a polynucleotide encoding a fusion protein comprising the full length LBLOX of Hohne et al. and a target protein of interest, such as enzymes involved in fatty acid/lipid metabolism. Alternatively, it would have been obvious to one having ordinary skill in the art at the time the claimed invention was to identify sequences that target LBOX to lipid bodies in order to target other proteins of interest, such as enzymes involved in fatty acid/lipid metabolism, to lipid bodies. Upon identifying the targeting sequences, it would have been obvious to one having ordinary skill in the art at the time the claimed invention was made to make a polynucleotide encoding a fusion protein comprising said sequences and a fatty acid/lipid metabolism enzyme of interest, such as the desaturase of Ohlrogge et al., using the method taught by Yamamoto et al. One having ordinary skill in the art would have been motivated to use full length LBLOX or to identify sequences that target LBLOX to lipid bodies, in order to use them to target other proteins, such as enzymes involved in fatty acid/lipid metabolism, to lipid bodies, and make a polynucleotide encoding a fusion comprising said sequence and desaturase, thereby directing the enzyme to the site where its activity is desired. One of ordinary skill in the art would have had a reasonable expectation of success in making the polynucleotide since making polynucleotides encoding fusion proteins is well known in the art, as taught by Yamamoto et al. One of ordinary skill in the art would have had a reasonable expectation of success in making a fusion protein comprising the full

Art Unit: 1652

length LBLOX to target protein to lipid bodies since Hohne et al. teaches that the full length LBLOX is targeted to lipid bodies. Similarly, one of ordinary skill in the art would have had a reasonable expectation of success in identifying N-terminal sequences of LBLOX of Hohne et al. that target proteins to lipid bodies and making a fusion protein comprising such N-terminal sequences to target protein to lipid bodies since Hohne et al. teaches that the N-terminal region of the LBLOX may be responsible for targeting proteins to lipid bodies.

Therefore, Hohne et al., Ohlrogge et al. and Yamamoto et al. in combination render claims 1-4, 6, 8-9 and 10-14 *prima facie* obvious to those skilled in the art.

In response to the previous Office Action, applicants have traversed the above rejection. Examiner notes that since the claims do not recite that the fusion partner to the desaturase consist of SEQ ID NO:2, but encompasses full length LBLOX of Hohne et al., the rejection has been amended.

Applicants argue Examiner's interpretation of Hohne et al. is in error since one skilled in the art, upon reading Hohne et al., would not be able to determine the targeting sequence because Hohne et al. is directed toward the biochemical characterization of a LBLOX from cucumber because Hohne et al. states:

"the part of the molecule that may represent a targeting sequence and the domain of this lipoxygenase form that by be responsible for its attachment to the lipid body surface remain to be determine from the primary structure".

Applicants point out that the latter part of the sentence should be noted wherein it is explicitly disclosed that targeting sequence remains to be determined from the

Art Unit: 1652

primary structure. Therefore, there is no teaching or suggestion that LBLOX should be fused with another lipid protein and made to target lipid bodies.

Examiner respectfully disagrees. It appears that it is applicants' interpretation of Hohne et al. that is in error. The portion of Hohne et al. is taken out of context.

Hohne et al.; in the same paragraph, discusses LBLOX in further detail and

ultimately concludes that:

"A closer inspection of the CSLBLOX sequence suggests that the N-terminal extension outlined in Fig. 3 represent a lipid-body – specific site."

Therefore, one having ordinary skill in the art would upon reading Hohne et al. ~~would~~ recognize that the N-terminal portion of CSLBLOX is the targeting sequence toward lipid bodies. Further, is well within the skill available in the art to identify sequences in the N-terminal region of LBLOX that target LBLOX to lipid bodies and attach any protein to such sequences, in order to target the protein of interest to lipid bodies.

Applicants also argue that Examiner is applying an "obvious to try" standard combined with impermissible hindsight. Examiner respectfully disagrees. In response to applicant's argument that Examiner is applying an "obvious to try" standard, MPEP 2145 teaches that:

"The admonition that 'obvious to try' is not the standard under § 103 has been directed mainly at two kinds of error. In some cases, what would have been 'obvious to try' would have been to vary all parameters or try each of numerous possible choices until one possibly arrived at a successful result, where the prior art gave either no indication of which parameters were critical or no direction as to which of many possible choices is likely to be successful.... "

Art Unit: 1652

However, in the instant case, the prior art provides which parameters are critical and direction as to which regions of LBLOX to alter, N-terminal region of LBLOX. Therefore, Examiner has not applied an improper "obvious to try" standard.

In response to applicant's argument that the examiner's conclusion of obviousness is based upon improper hindsight reasoning, it must be recognized that any judgment on obviousness is in a sense necessarily a reconstruction based upon hindsight reasoning. But so long as it takes into account only knowledge which was within the level of ordinary skill at the time the claimed invention was made, and does not include knowledge gleaned only from the applicant's disclosure, such a reconstruction is proper. See *In re McLaughlin*, 443 F.2d 1392, 170 USPQ 209 (CCPA 1971). In the instant case, it should be noted that Hohne et al. teaches that the N-terminal region of the LBLOX targets proteins to lipid bodies and that the knowledge of identifying sequences in the N-terminal region of LBLOX that target LBLOX to lipid bodies and attach any protein to such sequences, in order to target the protein of interest to lipid bodies, was well known and within the level of one having ordinary skill in the art at the time the invention was made.

Applicants also argue that the prior art does not give general guidance as to from, because it does not suggest combining sequence of LBLOX with a fatty acid or lipid sequence. It appears that applicant's arguments are against the references individually, one cannot show nonobviousness by attacking references individually where the rejections are based on combinations of references. See *In re Keller*, 642 F.2d 413, 208 USPQ 871 (CCPA 1981); *In re*

Art Unit: 1652

*Merck & Co.*, 800 F.2d 1091, 231 USPQ 375 (Fed. Cir. 1986). The rejection is based on Hohne et al., Ohlrogge et al. and Yamamoto et al. The reference of Hohne et al. is relied upon for its teaching of protein which is targeted to lipid bodies and N-terminal regions of said protein responsible for its target to lipid bodies. The claims do not recite that the fusion partner to the desaturase consist of SEQ ID NO:2, therefore, full length LBLOX of Hohne et al. is encompassed in the scope of the claims. Combining the teachings of the above references it would have been obvious to one having ordinary skill in the art at the time the claimed invention was made to make a polynucleotide encoding a fusion protein comprising the full length LBLOX of Hohne et al. and a target protein of interest, such as enzymes involved in fatty acid/lipid metabolism. Alternatively, it would have been obvious to one having ordinary skill in the art at the time the claimed invention was to identify sequences that target LBOX to lipid bodies in order to target other proteins of interest, such as enzymes involved in fatty acid/lipid metabolism, to lipid bodies. Upon identifying the targeting sequences, it would have been obvious to one having ordinary skill in the art at the time the claimed invention was made to make a polynucleotide encoding a fusion protein comprising said sequences and a fatty acid/lipid metabolism enzyme of interest, such as the desaturase of Ohlrogge et al., using the method taught by Yamamoto et al.

Applicants also argue that no teaching is made of what the target sequence is, and all this is suggest is that what remain unknown is whether the part of the molecule, referenced in the discussion of the article, represents a

Art Unit: 1652

targeting sequence. Examiner respectfully disagrees. As discussed above, Hohne et al. does indeed teach that the N-terminal region of CSLBLOX is the target sequence to oil bodies. Also, Hohne et al. teaches that LBLOX is synthesized and transported to lipid bodies at the beginning of lipid body mobilization, during which fatty acids/lipids are metabolized (pages 6 and 8-9). Hohne et al. also teaches that a comparison between the molecular mass of the *in vitro* and *in vivo* form of LBLOX did not indicate significant proteolytic processing and LBLOX is only slightly higher in mass than its cytosolic form and suggests that the N-terminal region of LBLOX contains a recognition site for lipid bodies (page 10). It is well within the skill available in the art to identify sequences in the N-terminal region of LBLOX that target LBLOX to lipid bodies or the full length LBLOX and attach any protein to such sequences, in order to target the protein of interest to lipid bodies.

Applicants argue that Ohlrogge et al. fails to disclose combining a desaturase with LBLOX. It appears that applicant's arguments are against the references individually, one cannot show nonobviousness by attacking references individually where the rejections are based on combinations of references. See *In re Keller*, 642 F.2d 413, 208 USPQ 871 (CCPA 1981); *In re Merck & Co.*, 800 F.2d 1091, 231 USPQ 375 (Fed. Cir. 1986). The rejection is based on Hohne et al., Ohlrogge et al. and Yamamoto et al. The reference of Ohlrogge et al. is relied upon for its teaching of polynucleotide encoding a  $\Delta$ -4 desaturase, which is an enzyme of fatty acid/lipid metabolism (abstract). Upon combining the teachings of the above references, it would have been obvious to

Art Unit: 1652

one having ordinary skill in the art at the time the claimed invention was made to make a polynucleotide encoding a fusion protein comprising the full length LBLOX of Hohne et al. and a target protein of interest, such as enzymes involved in fatty acid/lipid metabolism. Alternatively, it would have been obvious to one having ordinary skill in the art at the time the claimed invention was to identify sequences that target LBOX to lipid bodies in order to target other proteins of interest, such as enzymes involved in fatty acid/lipid metabolism, to lipid bodies. Upon identifying the targeting sequences, it would have been obvious to one having ordinary skill in the art at the time the claimed invention was made to make a polynucleotide encoding a fusion protein comprising said sequences and a fatty acid/lipid metabolism enzyme of interest, such as the desaturase of Ohlrogge et al., using the method taught by Yamamoto et al.

Applicants argue that Yamamoto et al. is silent about a method for the targeting of proteins as claimed in the present invention. Examiner respectfully disagrees. The claims, however, are drawn to a polynucleotide and not a method of targeting proteins, and the claims do not recite targeting proteins to liposomes or lipid bodies.

Applicants also argue that Yamamoto et al. fails to provide a suggestion for use of the fusion process for combining LBLXO and desaturase. It appears that applicant's arguments are against the references individually, one cannot show nonobviousness by attacking references individually where the rejections are based on combinations of references. See *In re Keller*, 642 F.2d 413, 208 USPQ 871 (CCPA 1981); *In re Merck & Co.*, 800 F.2d 1091, 231 USPQ 375



Art Unit: 1652

(Fed. Cir. 1986). The rejection is based on Hohne et al., Ohlrogge et al. and Yamamoto et al. The reference of Yamamoto et al. is relied upon for its teaching of teaches a polynucleotide encoding a fusion protein, linking proteins via a regulatory signal, vectors comprising said polynucleotide and a *Saccharomyces cerevisiae* comprising said polynucleotide (abstract and Columns 5-14). Upon Combining the teachings of the above references, it would have been obvious to one having ordinary skill in the art at the time the claimed invention was made to make a polynucleotide encoding a fusion protein comprising the full length LBLOX of Hohne et al. and a target protein of interest, such as enzymes involved in fatty acid/lipid metabolism. Alternatively, it would have been obvious to one having ordinary skill in the art at the time the claimed invention was to identify sequences that target LBOX to lipid bodies in order to target other proteins of interest, such as enzymes involved in fatty acid/lipid metabolism, to lipid bodies. Upon identifying the targeting sequences, it would have been obvious to one having ordinary skill in the art at the time the claimed invention was made to make a polynucleotide encoding a fusion protein comprising said sequences and a fatty acid/lipid metabolism enzyme of interest, such as the desaturase of Ohlrogge et al., using the method taught by Yamamoto et al.

Applicant also argue that even if the references can be combined, there is no motivation to combine the references. Examiner respectfully disagrees. As discussed in the rejection, one having ordinary skill in the art would have been motivated to use full length LBLOX or to identify sequences that target LBLOX to lipid bodies, in order to use them to target other proteins, such as enzymes

Art Unit: 1652

involved in fatty acid/lipid metabolism, to lipid bodies, and make a polynucleotide encoding a fusion comprising said sequence and desaturase, thereby directing the enzyme to the site where its activity is desired

Applicants also argue that not all the limitations of the current claims are disclosed. Examiner request applicants to point out which limitations of the current claims are not disclosed.

Hence the rejection is maintained.

None of the claims are allowable.

Any inquiry concerning this communication or earlier communications from the examiner should be directed to Yong Pak whose telephone number is 571-272-0935. The examiner can normally be reached 6:30 A.M. to 5:00 P.M. Monday through Thursday.

If attempts to reach the examiner by telephone are unsuccessful, the examiner's supervisor, Ponnathapu Achutamurthy can be reached on 571-272-0928. The fax phone numbers for the organization where this application or proceeding is assigned are 571-273-8300 for regular communications and 703-872-9307 for After Final communications.

Any inquiry of a general nature or relating to the status of this application or proceeding should be directed to the receptionist whose telephone number is 571-272-1600.

Yong D. Pak  
Patent Examiner 1652  
1652

  
Manjunath Rao  
Primary Patent Examiner